

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 9 December 2021 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Brad Inman opened the meeting (in the absence of Mark Wingate) at 9:30 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Patrick Williams, National Marine and Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Mr. Brad Inman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman
Mr. Brian Lezina, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
Mr. Kevin Roy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

A copy of the agenda is included as **Encl 1**. A copy of the attendance sheet is included as **Encl 2**.

2. Agenda Item 1. Meeting Initiation

The meeting was conducted via WebEx virtual meeting platform, due to ongoing COVID 19 public gathering restrictions. Mr. Inman introduced himself, and asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves, which they did. Mr. Inman began with good wishes for the Holiday Season. He also remarked about the on-going virtual meeting format, and the merits thereof, but expressed his preference for and anticipation of resuming in-person meetings.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to remarks from the Technical Committee. Mr. Roy announced that he will be stepping down as Chair of the Environmental Workgroup; Kristen Ramsey (formerly with CPRA) has been chosen as his replacement. Mr. Inman commended Mr. Roy for his excellent service in that role. Mr. Inman reported that the USACE Program Administration (specifically naming Jernice Cheavis) has been conducting an extensive review of CWPPRA projects pertinent to the completion of close-out processes. As a result of those efforts, approximately \$30 million will be returned to the Program and is available for funding requests in today's proceedings.

Mr. Inman called for any changes to the agenda; none were proffered. He asked for a motion to adopt the agenda as presented.

DECISION: The motion to accept the agenda as presented was made by Mr. Paul, seconded by Ms. McCormick, and carried without opposition.

Finally, Mr. Inman reviewed the process for public comment via the WebEx platform.

3. Agenda Item 2. Report: Status of CWPPRA Program Funds and Projects

Ms. Jernice Cheavis, USACE, presented an overview of CWPPRA funds. The fully funded total Program Estimate since its inception to the present (authorized projects from PPLs 1 – 30) is \$3.112 billion. The total funded estimate (received since inception, and anticipated through FY2022) is \$2.198 billion, leaving a potential gap of \$914 million if the Program were to construct, operate and maintain all projects to date. This gap will be altered as future federal

funding is appropriated for CWPPRA beyond 2022. Current Task Force-approved funding for projects in Phase I, Phase II, and O&M and Monitoring totals \$2.302 billion. The estimate of authorized funding for each agency as requested currently totals \$1.971 billion.

The CWPPRA Program has \$12,054,416 of funding carried forth from the May Task Force meeting. The June 2021 DOI funding projection for FY21 is \$90,826,062, of which \$5 million must be set aside for Planning activities. In October, the Task Force approved FY20 Planning budget and other funding requests resulting in a deduction of \$17,377,625 to the available balance. As reported previously, \$32,220,376.12 has been returned to the Program budget, bringing the total Program funding to begin today's proceedings to \$112,723,129.12. (This total will be updated as voting results are obtained throughout today's proceedings.)

CWPPRA has authorized 230 projects. Of the 126 active projects, 27 are in Phase 1 Engineering and Design, 19 are in Phase II Construction, and 6 are technical support projects. There are 74 projects, which have been constructed and are now in O&M and Monitoring phase, and 40 projects that have been completed and closed financially. Additionally, CWPPRA has deauthorized 49 projects, transferred 10 projects, and placed 5 in the inactive category. The 6 technical support projects include Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS), Monitoring Contingency Fund, Storm Recovery Procedures, Construction Program technical support, the Wetland Conservation Plan, and the newly instated Programmatic Signage project.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. Mr. Williams inquired about the timeline pertaining to the annual DOI contribution. Ms. Cheavis explained that the DOI estimate is incorporated into the budget when the authorization letter is received (typically in November or December) each year. The funds are received (in actuality) the following spring. Mr. Lezina commended Mr. Cheavis and all involved in the review of projects, and the return of funds to the Program. Ms. Cheavis remarked about the cooperation and concerted effort required. Mr. Inman reiterated the depth of investigation that was necessary in the review of project close-outs and predicted further revenue as a result of continuing analysis.

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: *Electronic Votes and Approvals (Sarah Bradley, USACE)*

Ms. Bradley reported on recent electronic voting results, which occurred as a result of the September 2021 Technical Committee and October 2021 Task Force meetings having been cancelled (due to the August 29th landfall of Hurricane Ida.) On September 29, 2021, the Technical Committee approved all motions for recommendations to the Task Force. On November 1, 2021, the CWPPRA Task Force approved all recommendations; Ms. Bradley highlighted a few as follows:

- The final draft of the 2021 Report to Congress
- Funding for the Programmatic Signage support project
- The 20-year project life extension of CS-23
- The Scope Change for TE-117
- Typical Incremental requests for Administrative Costs, USGS Technical Services, and O&M and Monitoring (including the annual CRMS contribution).

Ms. Bradley asserted that full details were provided prior to voting and are available to the public through the CWPPRA *Newsflash* e-mails, LACoast.gov website, and the USACE website.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered.

5. Agenda Item 4. Report: *Bio-Engineered Oyster Reef Creation Demonstration (LA-08) Project Final Report (Donna Rogers, NMFS)*

Ms. Rogers began with a review of the project, which was authorized in PPL-17, and is positioned in the Gulf of Mexico just off the Rockefeller NWR. The project consists of two 215 ft. structures placed 140 ft apart; one structure was composed of concrete and the other of “OysterKrete®” – to compare their respective efficacy in wave attenuation and oyster production, as well as their structural stability on low load-bearing soils at the site. Naturally occurring variations in water depths resulted in differing slopes and depths of the structures upon construction. The concrete structure was built at a higher elevation but settled more; the OysterKrete structure was submerged more often but settled less. Evaluation is based on monitoring data from the 2.5-year project age. The concrete structure was deemed 66% more effective in the prevention of soil erosion, and about 15% more effective in wave attenuation, although these comparisons are likely a result of the concrete structure being built at a higher elevation. Oyster accumulation was minimal on both structures, although slightly better on the leeward side of the concrete structure. Ms. Rogers summarized lessons learned in the demonstration project thus:

- 90% of project costs were for construction.
- A mix of the two materials on each structure may have provided a better comparison of stability,
- Smaller gaps between structures would have provided more erosion protection behind them,
- Higher construction elevation provides more erosion protection,
- Wave action and predation along the Gulf shoreline are natural inhibitors of oyster production, especially on the windward side.

Finally, Ms. Rogers asserted that original intent was to integrate the LA-08 project within the ME-18 project (constructed in 2019), but ongoing soil erosion necessitated the placement of ME-18 behind LA-08. Plans are to eventually combine the adjacent projects, and LDWF will assume management responsibility of both as CWPPRA project life expires.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. Laurie Cormier provided positive commentary in the chat feature, iterating her relief of the reported minimal damage during recent hurricanes (Laura and Delta) and her general support of demonstration projects. No further public comments were proffered.

6. Agenda Item 5. Report: *Construction Update for Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation (BA-171) Project (Karen McCormick, EPA)*

Ms. McCormick presented the update on behalf of CPRA and EPA. She reviewed the project location, which is in Lafourche Parish, south of LA Hwy 1 between Belle Pass and Caminada Pass. She asserted its synergy with BA-45 and BA 143, which were constructed 2015 and 2016. She described project goals – to create and nourish 1,000 acres of marsh behind 8 miles of beach providing storm surge protection to Port Fourchon and surrounding communities. The timeline included Phase I approval in January 2014, Phase II approval in February 2018, the inclusion of BA-193 into the project footprint, and a notice to proceed in April 2020. The south containment area was heavily damaged during Hurricane Zeta in October 2020; repairs and additional migratory bird monitoring became necessary in the aftermath. Dredge piping was staged in anticipation of north containment construction. Prior to landfall of Hurricane Ida in August 2021, southern containment was 100% complete and the northern containment area was 98% complete. Extensive storm damage was realized; photographic evidence shows several containment breaches as well as dredge pipe displacement, and valve and weir damage. The construction contractor is tasked with devising a suitable plan for repair, but the full extent and costs were not completed in time for these proceedings; a field survey of the containment areas is scheduled before the end of this calendar year. Ms. McCormick anticipates sending a request for funding to the Technical Committee prior to the January 2022 Task Force meeting, with hopes that dredging may resume in April 2022. Original project designs have not been altered at this point. She commended the project team and all stakeholders for their efforts and dedication to this project.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee. Mr. Inman shared his recently acquired understanding that Hurricane Ida may be placed in the “Top Ten” category for strongest storms to have impacted the United States, and that of those ten, seven have made landfall in Louisiana. This fact only reinforces the need for coastal restoration along the Gulf of Mexico. He also asserted that many projects fared well during the storms, proving that successful coastal restoration can be attained.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public; none were proffered.

7. Agenda Item 6. Decision: *Request for an O&M Budget Increase for the Terrebonne Bay Shore Protection Demonstration (TE-45) Project (Kevin Roy, FWS)*

Mr. Roy began with a review of project location and features. Three different erosion control treatments (Reef Blocks, A-Jacks, and Gabion Mats) were placed in two areas of Terrebonne Bay to compare their performance in shoreline erosion reduction and oyster reef production. The project was approved in 2001 and construction was completed in 2007 (with a fixed 8-year end-of-life.) Total cost was \$2.7 million, with an additional \$500,000 for O&M granted in 2018. All three treatments showed some success, but the Gabion Mats were deemed to have been most effective in both cost and attainment of project goals. As part of project closeout in 2020, all features were removed to avoid marine/boating hazards. Mr. Roy presented today’s request for an O&M budget increase to cover an inadvertent over-expenditure of \$67,016 (apparently due to indirect costs) and proceed to final project closeout.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman called for a motion to approve and recommend to the Task Force a budget increase of \$67,016 for TE-45 final project closeout.

DECISION: Mr. Roy made the motion, which Mr. Williams seconded; the motion carried without opposition.

8. Agenda Item 7. Decision: Request for Additional Site Selections for Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39) Project (Quin Kinler, NRCS)

The LA-39 project was set up to select sites annually for 10 years, with O&M and Monitoring so the project has a typical 20-year life. After 10 years of site selections, 30 sites have been planted in 14 coastal parishes, with 3 additional sites scheduled to be planted in 2022. Currently, there is over \$3 million remaining in the project budget. On behalf of NRCS and CPRA, Mr. Kinler hereby requested a Technical Committee recommendation to allow use of those funds to select, plant, and monitor additional sites for five years. This request does not include additional funds or project life extensions.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. Ms. Cormier asked that the Chenier Plain be considered as a future planting location; Mr. Kinler responded with assurances.

Mr. Inman called for a motion to approve and recommend to the Task Force the utilization of unexpended LA-39 funds for the selection, planting and monitoring of future vegetative planting sites.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made the motion, which Mr. Lezina seconded; the motion carried without opposition.

9. Agenda Item 8. (Item re-ordered) Decision: Request for a Change in Scope for the PPL25 – Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing (PO-173) Project (Brandon Howard, NMFS)

Mr. Howard began his appeal by emphasizing that this is not a request for an increase in Phase I funding; it is a scope change request for a shift in specific project location. The Fritchie Marsh is located southeast of Slidell, north of Lake St. Catherine, between I-10 and Hwy 90. He explained that several potential locations within the marsh have been envisioned for this project since it was approved. Multiple landowners, multiple mitigation efforts, evolving hydrology/flooding concerns, and the need to minimize impacts on critical habitat in the marsh have complicated the process, but Mr. Howard illustrated the latest (and most viable) location alternative to date. The determined location lies within the northeastern-most area of Fritchie Marsh; features include 288 acres of marsh creation in two confined cells and a 197-acre terrace field. Mr. Howard asserts that construction risks are low because of good soils, and that this location would benefit the communities of Lacombe and Slidell and the Big Branch NWR. A scope change is required when an increase in the fully funded cost and the ratio of the total cost-per-net-acre-created exceeds 25% from the Phase 0 estimate. In this case the increases are 40% and 50.4% respectively. Mr. Howard pointed out that even with this increase, the costs are within the range of most CWPPRA projects.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman called for a motion to approve and recommend to the Task Force this change in scope (without a cost increase) for PO-173 Phase I Engineering and Design.

DECISION: Mr. Williams made the motion, which Mr. Lezina seconded; the motion carried without opposition.

10. Agenda Item 9. Report/Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Sarah Bradley, USACE)

Representatives from the sponsoring agencies provided an overview detailing location, features, benefits and costs for each project listed in the following table:

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Phase II, Increment 1 Request	Fully-Funded Phase 1 Cost	Fully-Funded Phase II Cost incl O&M	Total Fully Funded Cost Est.	Net Benefit Acres	Total Cost per Acre
FWS	BS-24	22	Terracing and Marsh Creation South of Big Mar	\$22,467,322	\$2,308,599	\$23,907,328	\$26,215,927	322	\$81,416
NMFS	BS-38	28	Breton Landbridge MC (West) River aux Chenes to Grand Lake	\$26,459,920	\$3,837,365	\$27,939,717	\$31,777,082	379	\$83,845
FWS	BA-217	28	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration-Increment 1	\$36,173,264	\$3,463,474	\$37,406,527	\$40,870,001	297	\$137,609
NRCS	BA-195	25	Barataria Bay Rim Marsh Creation and Nourishment	\$26,543,561	\$2,693,708	\$27,600,583	\$30,294,291	226	\$134,046
NRCS	BA-206	27	Northeast Turtle Bay	\$32,341,815	\$3,952,451	\$33,571,605	\$37,524,056	536	\$70,008
NRCS	TE-112	22	North Catfish Lake	\$31,121,999	\$3,216,194	\$32,321,142	\$35,537,336	489	\$72,673
NMFS	TE-117	23	Island Road Marsh Creation and Nourishment Project	\$24,722,496	\$3,721,447	\$26,136,944	\$29,858,391	206	\$144,944
NRCS	ME-31	19	Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation	\$28,868,058	\$2,425,997	\$30,252,567	\$32,678,564	283	\$115,472
NMFS	CS-78	24	No Name Bayou Marsh Creation	\$27,022,820	\$2,724,524	\$28,491,392	\$31,215,916	468	\$66,701
NMFS	CS-79	25	Oyster Lake Marsh Creation and Nourishment	\$36,025,729	\$3,608,939	\$37,323,973	\$40,932,912	250	\$163,732

Following the presentation, Mr. Inman remarked on the number of projects being considered for Phase II authorization (many more than is typical), and the \$30+ million investment already made in Phase I of the projects presented.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee. Mr. Williams clarified that the Phase II Increment I request of \$26.5 million for BA-38 as presented in the agenda is correct, rather than the amount presented on the last slide of that presentation.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. Laurie Cormier spoke in favor of CS-78, CS-79 and ME-31, citing dire need in the aftermath of 4 recent federally declared disasters in the Chenier Plain, the cost-effectiveness of CS-78 (in particular), and referencing resolutions from governing authorities encouraging the construction of these three projects. Thor Olsen used the chat feature to remark on the -1.75% land loss rate but did not reference a specific project. Mark Black wrote expressing support of projects in Terrebonne Parish. Kara Bonssall (Cameron Parish Police Jury) reiterated Ms. Cormier’s statements for Cal-Sab basin projects, particularly CS-78 and 79. Oneil Malbrough (Port of Iberia) spoke in support of ME-31, which directly protects industries and businesses inland.

Following the public comments, the Technical Committee went into a breakout session (12:15 p.m.) with parish and voting representatives to evaluate and vote on the projects being considered.

The meeting reconvened at 12:55 p.m. Sarah Bradley, USACE, reviewed the ranking matrix and results, with the top-ranked projects highlighted as follows:

CWPPRA Technical Committee Ranking for Phase II Approval, Dec 2021										9-Dec-21
PPL	Project No.	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	STATE	No. of Agency Votes	Sum of Weighted Score
28	BS-38	Breton Landbridge MC (West) River aux Chenes to Grand Lake	6	6	4	6	2	4	6	28
27	BA-206	Northeast Turtle Bay	5	5	2	4	6	3	6	25
24	CS-78	No Name Bayou Marsh Creation	3	2	1	5	3	5	6	19
28	BA-217	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration-Increment 1	2	4	6	2		6	5	20
22	TE-112	North Catfish Lake	4	3	5	3	5		5	20
19	ME-31	Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation	1	1			4	2	4	8
22	BS-24	Terracing and Marsh Creation South of Big Mar			3				1	3
25	BA-195	Barataria Bay Rim Marsh Creation and Nourishment					1		1	1
23	TE-117	Island Road Marsh Creation and Nourishment Project				1			1	1
25	CS-79	Oyster Lake Marsh Creation and Nourishment						1	1	1
		No. of votes:	6	6	6	6	6	6		
		Sum of Votes:	21	21	21	21	21	21	36	126
		check	21	21	21	21	21	21	36	126

Mr. Inman called upon Ms. Cheavis to update available funding. Ms. Cheavis first subtracted \$67,016 (approved previously for TE-45 project close-out) from the available balance. She calculated today's Phase II Increment I funding requests totaling \$85,824,555. If these three top-ranked projects are recommended to the Task Force for funding, a \$26,831,658 balance would remain in available funds for Phase I voting (the next agenda item.)

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman called for a motion to recommend to the Task Force the three top-ranking projects for Phase II Authorization and Phase II Increment I Funding Approval.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made the motion, which Mr. Williams seconded; the motion carried without opposition.

11. Agenda Item 10. Report/Decision: *31st Priority Project List (Kristen Ramsey, FWS)*

Ms. Ramsey was once again introduced as the incoming Environmental Workgroup Chairman. She presented an overview of the ten PPL 31 candidate projects competing for Phase I Engineering and Design funding. Ms. Ramsey synopsized the location, scope, benefits, synergies, net acreage and total costs of each project as follows:

Region	Basin	PPL 31 Candidates	Agency
2	Breton Sound	Spanish Lake-Grand Lake Marsh Creation	FWS
2	Barataria	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration - Increment 2	FWS
2	Barataria	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension	NRCS
2	Barataria	Southeast Golden Meadow Marsh Creation	FWS
3	Terrebonne	Jug Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
3	Terrebonne	Port Fourchon Marsh Creation	EPA
3	Terrebonne	West Louisiana Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation and Terraces	NRCS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	East Cove Marsh Creation	NRCS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Mud Lake South Marsh Creation	EPA

In conclusion, Ms. Ramsey presented a table depicting the evaluation matrix used to compare costs and benefits of each project. She pointed out that the Port's authorized contribution (an estimated \$7.4) has not be included in the table for the Port Fourchon Marsh Creation candidate project.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public; Ms. Laurie Cormier iterated her support for the two projects in the Chenier Plain – East Cove Marsh Creation and Mus Lake South Marsh Creation.

Following the public comments, the Technical Committee went into a breakout session (1:10 p.m.) with parish and voting representatives to evaluate and vote on the projects being considered.

The meeting reconvened and Ms. Bradley reviewed the following results:

CWPPRA PPL 31 Technical Committee VOTE									9-Dec-21
Region	Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
4	East Cove Marsh Creation	3	6	2	3	4	5	6	23
3	Port Fourchon Marsh Creation	5	1	6	4	3	1	6	20
2	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration - Increment 2	1	5	4	6	2		5	18
2	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension		2	3	1	1	6	5	13
2	Southeast Golden Meadow Marsh Creation	6	4	1	2			4	13
3	Jug Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing		3			6	4	3	13
2	Spanish Lake-Grand Lake Marsh Creation	4			5		2	3	11
3	West Louisiana Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	2				5		2	7
4	Mud Lake South Marsh Creation			5				1	5
4	Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation and Terraces						3	1	3
		21	21	21	21	21	21	36	126
		check 21	21	21	21	21	21	36	126

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman called for a motion to recommend to the Task Force the four top-ranking projects for Phase I Authorization and Funding Approval.

DECISION: Mr. Roy made the motion to recommend the East Cove Marsh Creation, Port Fourchon Marsh Creation, Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Creation- Increment I, and the Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension projects to the Task Force for Phase I funding; Mr. Kinler seconded the motion, which carried without opposition.

12. Agenda Item 11. *Additional Agenda Items (Sarah Bradley, USACE)*

Mr. Inman called for any additional agenda items; none were proffered.

13. Agenda Item 12. *Request for Public Comments (Sarah Bradley, USACE)*

Mr. Inman called for final public comment; none were proffered.

14. Agenda Item 13. Announcement: Priority Project List 32 Regional Planning Team Meetings (Sarah Bradley, USACE)

Ms. Bradley imparted the following CWPPRA meeting schedule:

February 8, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	TBD
February 9, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	TBD
February 10, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Region I & II Planning Team Meeting	TBD
February 24, 2022	10:30 a.m.	Coastwide Electronic Voting	(via email, no meeting)

15. Agenda Item 14. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Sarah Bradley, USACE)

The Task Force meeting will be held January 27, 2022 at 9:30 a.m. Location is and format is TBD, but a virtual component will be made available regardless.

16. Agenda Item 15. Announcement: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings* (Sarah Bradley, USACE)

Ms. Bradley submitted the future CWPPRA Program meeting schedule:

January 27, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	TBD
February 8, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	TBD
February 9, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	TBD
February 10, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Region I & II Planning Team Meeting	TBD
April 7, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	TBD
May 5, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	TBD
September 1, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	TBD
October 6, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	TBD
December 8, 2022	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	TBD

*subject to change

16. Agenda Item 17. Decision: *Adjourn*

Mr. Wingate called for a motion to adjourn the proceedings. Mr. Williams made the motion, which Mr. Kinler seconded; the motion carried without dissent. Mr. Inman reiterated his appreciation for and compliments to the facilitators of the virtual meeting, and adjourned the proceedings at 1:45 p.m.